

REMARKS

The Official Action of February 6, 2006, and the prior art relied upon therein have been carefully reviewed. The claims in the application are now claims 1, 5, 9 and 13, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance, consistent with what is stated in the Office Action. The applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and allowance.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The title and abstract have been objected to, and the Examiner has required appropriate correction.

With respect to the title, applicants see nothing wrong with the original title. Nevertheless, in deference to the Examiner's views, the original title has been amended above, and the amended title is more detailed.

As regards the Abstract, the designation "(pure water)" is not misdiscriptive. It merely means that the calculations are based on pure water, although the composition does not require the presence of pure water. An appropriate correction has been made, and the spelling of the word "remainder" has been corrected.

The amendments to the title and abstract are not intended to create any limitations, and indeed do not do so. These are not substantial amendments relating to patentability, but are only formal, cosmetic changes.

The Office Action Summary indicates that claims 3, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 are objected to, and these claims are **not** indicated as being rejected. At the top of page 7 of the detailed Office Action, claims 3, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 are indicated as being directed to "allowable..." subject matter. Applicants accordingly understand that these claims, along with claims 4, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16, are deemed by the PTO to define novel and un-obvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103.

Accordingly, claim 3 has been re-written in independent form by an appropriate amendment of claim 1 to include the subject matter previously set forth in the dependent portion of claim 3, and claims 5, 9 and 13 depend either directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1 and therefore they also should be in condition for formal allowance.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 have now been deleted without prejudice to applicants rights, including those rights provided by Sections 120 and 119, to pursue those and/or similar claims in a continuing application without any penalty whatsoever, if applicants choose to do so.

Appln. No. 10/678,265
Amd. dated April 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

As the only claims remaining in the application at present are allowable claims, applicants need not at this time address the rejections including those based on the second paragraph of Section 112 and those based on the prior art.

The prior art documents of record and not relied upon by the PTO have been noted, along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently material to warrant their application against any of applicants' claims.

Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed above in a manner favorable to allowance of the present application. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and early formal allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:kg
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\A\ASAM\Ohkawa2\Pto\AMD 25APR06.doc